



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Mass. 415, 34 N. E. 657, 38 Am. St. Rep. 430, held that an estate by the entirety may exist in personal property. This case, however, was decided by an almost equally divided court.

INSANE PERSONS—POWERS OF COMMITTEE.—S. and T. were the committee of a lunatic. S. gave his consent to an adjoining land owner to underpin a party wall. In an action to compel the removal of a portion of this underpinning which encroached on the lunatic's land, *held*, that a committee of a lunatic is authorized within the limits of his trust to bind the lunatic by acts clearly for his benefit. *Sharpless et al. v. Boldt et al.* (1907), — Pa. —, 67 Atl. Rep. 652.

The decision in the principal case seems to be upheld in those states where the committee has power to lease the lunatic's lands. *Pierce's Appeal*, 13 Wkly. Notes Cas. (Pa.) 306. The following cases limit the committee's power to lease only for the life of the lunatic. *De Treville v. Ellis*, 1 Bailey Eq. (S. C.) 35, 21 Am. Dec. 518; *Campau v. Shaw*, 15 Mich. 226. That a portion of an estate covered by a mortgage may be released, see *Pickersgill v. Read*, 5 Hun (N. Y.) 170. That the committee may sell the lunatic's personal property, see *Spaulding v. Bullock*, 206 Pa. St. 224, 55 Atl. 965. On the other hand, the following cases hold that a committee has no power to make a lease without leave from the court. *Foster v. Marchant*, 1 Vern. 262; *Knipe v. Palmer*, 2 Wils. 130; *Alexander v. Buffington*, 66 Iowa 360, 23 N. W. 754; *Kent v. West*, 33 App. Div. (N. Y.) 112, 53 N. Y. S. 244; *Treat v. Peck*, 5 Conn. 280. That a lunatic cannot be prescribed against except in cases specially provided by law, see *Espinola v. Blasco*, 15 La. Ann. 426; *Sallier v. St. Louis W. & G. Ry. Co.*, 114 La. 1090, 38 So. 868. The guardian has no power, as such, to engage in business for, or by transfer to bind the estate of, a lunatic, nor can the probate court confer such power. *Michael v. Locke*, 80 Mo. 548; *Western Cement Co. v. Jones et al.*, 8 Mo. App. 373.

INSURANCE—ACCIDENT—SPECIAL INDEMNITIES—CONSTRUCTION OF POLICY.—The insured held an accident policy in the defendant company, which contained a "Special Indemnities" clause reading as follows: "This policy does not exclude indemnity for loss by accident as herein provided, caused or contributed to, wholly or partly, directly or indirectly, by sunstroke, freezing, gas, * * * racing, shooting, intoxicants, * * * ; but in any such event the liability of the company shall be one-half the amount of the ordinary accident indemnity specified for such loss." Insured was shot and killed by burglars. *Held*, under the "Special Indemnities" clause death by shooting is an accident for which the beneficiary can recover but one-half of the policy. *Bader v. New Amsterdam Casualty Co.* (1907), — Minn. —, 112 N. W. Rep. 1065.

The case is exceptional in at least one respect: the "special indemnities" clause is but infrequently found. The plaintiff, by the application of the rule of construction that cases of doubt or ambiguity should be resolved in favor of the insured, and the rule "*Noscitur a sociis*," attempts to bring the case within that class of cases which "hold in effect that an exception of certain